

### REMARKS

In an Office Action dated September 7, 2005, the Examiner: (1) objected to claims 12, 18, 25, and 38 for minor informalities; (2) rejected claims 1-6, 14-17, 19, 20, 30, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handfield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,663,496); (3) rejected claims 1-11, 14-27, 30, 32-34, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2005/0179530); (4) rejected claims 12, 13, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Betts (U.S. Pat. No. 4,991,439); (5) rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Anderson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,891,239); (6) rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Shoor (U.S. Pat. No. 3,185,869); and (7) rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Dauenhauer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,178,016).

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3-5, 12, 16-18, 25, and 38 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. No new matter has been added. By way of example, support for amendments to independent claims 1, 16, and 38 can be found in paragraph 28, page 4 of the Specification. Applicants further cancel claims 2, 14, 15, and 33 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 3-13, 16-32, and 34-38 are not anticipated or obvious based on the cited references and accordingly respectfully seek allowance of the pending claims for at least the reasons given below.

Concerning the objection to claims 12, 18, 25, and 38, each of these claims has been amended to correct the minor informalities identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 12, 18, 25, and 38.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 14-17, 19, 20, 30, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handfield, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 16. Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, independent claim 1 is patentable at least because Handfield does not teach a method for operating a tire pressure monitoring system, in which, information is transmitted to a controller at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, and information is transmitted at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than

the second sample rate. Handfield describes two embodiments, where in one embodiment each detector/transmitter unit 10 is powered by a battery and in the other embodiment each detector/transmitter unit is powered by a capacitive storage element. (col. 11, ll. 10-11, ll. 59-61). As part of the description of these two separate embodiments, Handfield notes that in the battery powered mode data may be transmitted to a receiver every one minute or every ten minutes, whereas in the capacitive storage element powered mode, data may be transmitted less frequently. (col. 11, ll. 10-14, ll. 59-67). Handfield, however, has no disclosure related to the sample rate of a sensor. In addition, Handfield does not teach or suggest any relationship between sampling rates and/or any relationship between the sampling rates and transmission rates. In contrast, amended claim 1 is directed to a method for operating a tire pressure monitoring system, in which, information is transmitted to a controller at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, and information is transmitted at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, as amended, claim 1 is not anticipated by Handfield. Claims 3-6 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and thus are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handfield.

For similar reasons as given above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is also not anticipated by Handfield, since Handfield does not teach a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Claims 17, 19, 20, 30, and 32 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons given

above with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 16, 17, 19, 20, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handfield.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-11, 14-27, 30, 32-34, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart, Applicants have amended claims 1, 16, and 38. Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, independent claim 1 is patentable at least because Stewart does not teach a method for operating a tire pressure monitoring system, in which, information is transmitted to a controller at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, and information is transmitted at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Stewart teaches a tire monitor that operates either in a normal mode or a sleep mode. (paragraph 84). In the normal mode, the tire monitor periodically measures the tire pressure, whereas in the sleep mode tire monitor is powered down to conserve energy, so in the sleep mode the tire monitor does not measure the tire pressure at all. (paragraph 84). In contrast, claim 1 is directed to a method for operating a tire pressure monitoring system, in which, information is transmitted to a controller at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, and information is transmitted at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Stewart. Claims 3-11 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and thus are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart.

For similar reasons as given above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is also not anticipated by Stewart, since Stewart does not teach a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first

operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Claims 17-27, 30, 32-34, and 37 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 16-27, 30, 32-34, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart.

For similar reasons as given above with respect to claim 1, claim 38 is also not anticipated by Stewart, since Stewart does not teach a tire pressure monitoring system comprising a transmitter operably coupled to a controller, wherein the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, wherein the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, and wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart.

Concerning the rejection of claims 12, 13, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Betts, Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 16, Stewart does not teach each and every element of these claims. Claims 12 and 13 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are thus patentable because Betts fails to cure the deficiency of teachings of Stewart. In particular, Betts does not teach or suggest a method for operating a tire pressure monitoring system, in which, information is transmitted to a controller at a first transmitting rate during a first operating mode, wherein the first transmitting rate is greater than a first sample rate, and information is transmitted at a second transmitting rate during a second operating mode, wherein the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Nor does Betts teach or suggest a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first

sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, even when combined (which they cannot be), Stewart and Betts do not make the subject matter of claims 12, 13, 28, and 29 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 12, 13, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Betts.

Regarding the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Anderson, Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons given above with respect to claim 16, from which claim 31 depends, Stewart does not teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 16. Anderson does not cure the deficiencies of teachings of Stewart. In particular, Anderson does not teach or suggest a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, even when combined (which they cannot be), Stewart and Anderson do not make the subject matter of claim 31 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Anderson.

With respect to the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Shoor, Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons given above with respect to claim 16, from which claim 35 depends, Stewart does not teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 16. Shoor does not cure the deficiencies of teachings of Stewart. In

particular, Shoor does not teach or suggest a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, even when combined (which they cannot be), Stewart and Shoor do not make the subject matter of claim 35 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Shoor.

Concerning the rejection of claim 36 under U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Dauenhauer, Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons given above with respect to claim 16, from which claim 36 depends, Stewart does not teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 16. Dauenhauer does not cure the deficiencies of teachings of Stewart. In particular, Dauenhauer does not teach or suggest a tire pressure monitoring system where a controller samples an indication of a sensed condition as sensed by a first sensor at a first sample rate during a first operating mode, and where the controller samples an indication of the sensed condition as sensed by the first sensor at a second sample rate during a second operating mode, and where a transmitter is operably coupled to the controller, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a first transmitting rate during the first operating mode, where the first transmitting rate is greater than the first sample rate, where the controller initiates transmitting by the transmitter of the information at a second transmitting rate during the second operating mode, and where the second transmitting rate is greater than the first transmitting rate and is greater than the second sample rate. Thus, even when combined (which they cannot be), Stewart and Dauenhauer do not make the subject matter of claim 36 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of Stewart and Dauenhauer.

Based on the reasons above, Applicants respectfully seek allowance of pending claims 1, 3-13, 16-32, and 34-38. Should issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (512) 996-6839. If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079.


Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescall Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Ranjeev Singh  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 47,093  
Telephone: (512) 996-6839  
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854